

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

STEPHEN M. SEELIG; VIKKI L.
SEELIG,

Plaintiffs,

v.

OLD VEGAS MANOR AND ESTATES
HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION; OLD
VEGAS RANCH LANDSCAPE
MAINTENANCE ASSOCIATION; TOMMY
URIBE; LARRY FRESINKSI; MARGARET
DENISE GUBLER; MARLA HOWARD;
FIRST SERVICE RESIDENTIAL NV;
RICKY J. MCANALLY; DOES I-X; ROE
CORPORATIONS I-X,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:20-cv-01976-APG-EJY

ORDER

Pending before the Court is Defendants' Joint Request to Extend Time for Filing Dispositive Motion Under Fed. R. Civ. P. 15, Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(A), and LR IA 6-1 and for Leave to Increase Page Length for Joint Dispositive Motion (ECF No. 77). Defendants Old Vegas Ranch Landscape Maintenance Association ("OVRMA") and Ricky McAnally filed the Motion, which Defendants Old Vegas Manor and Estates Homeowners Association ("OVME"), Tommy Uribe, Larry Fresinski, Marla Howard, and First Service Residential NV joined (ECF No. 78)¹. The Court has considered Defendants' Joint Motion to Extend Time, Plaintiffs' Response (ECF No. 81), and Defendants' Reply (ECF No. 82).

The Court granted a previous Joint Request to Extend Time for Filing Dispositive Motions (ECF No. 76), which extended Defendants' deadline until February 10, 2022. Defendants in the instant Motion asked to extend the deadline a second time, but, as stated in their Reply, were ultimately able to complete and file the dispositive motion in question, a Joint Motion for Partial Dismissal of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint (ECF No. 79), on February 10, 2022. ECF No.

¹ The Court will refer to both groups of defendants collectively as "Defendants" going forward.

82 at 2-3. Therefore, the Joint Request to Extend Time for Filing Dispositive Motions is denied as moot.

Defendants, however, still ask the Court to increase the page limit for the jointly filed Motion to Dismiss, arguing an increased page limit is necessary to respond to Plaintiffs' 82-page Amended Complaint, especially considering the joint nature of the Motion to Dismiss. ECF No. 82 at 3. Defendants' Motion to Dismiss is currently 35 pages, in excess of the 24-page limit under Local Rule 7-3. ECF No. 79. Defendants argue that they chose to file a joint Motion to Dismiss to streamline the litigation and that the request for a page limit extension is made in good faith. *Id.* Plaintiff's Response asserts that increasing the page limitation would be "detrimental" for Plaintiffs, but the Response does not explain with specificity what prejudice Plaintiffs will suffer as a result of extending the page limit. ECF No. 81 at 3. The Court finds Defendants' request reasonable in light of the length of Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint and the number of defendants to the Motion to Dismiss.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendants' Joint Request to Extend Time for Filing Dispositive Motion Under Fed. R. Civ. P. 15, Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(A), and LR IA 6-1 and for Leave to Increase Page Length for Joint Dispositive Motion (ECF No. 77) is GRANTED in part and DENIED in part.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants' Joint Request to Extend Time is DENIED as moot.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants' Joint Request for Leave to Increase Page Length for Joint Dispositive Motion is GRANTED. Defendants' Joint Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 79) may exceed the 24-page limitation up to a total of 35 pages.

Dated this 14 day of February, 2022.


ELAYNA J. YOUCHAH
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE